

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/628,135	MATSUMOTO ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Tony Mahmoudi	2165	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Fritz Klantschi (Attorney of Record).

(3) Charles L. Rones.

(2) Raymond Di Perna (Attorney of Record).

(4) Tony Mahmoudi.

Date of Interview: 23 December 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 7, 13 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner called Mr. Fritz Klantschi (Attorney of Record) on 10-December-2004 and indicated that the phrase "may be" recited in the amended independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 would raise new rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and recommended that the "may be" phrases to be changed to "are" in the above independent claims. On 23-December-2004, Attorney of Record, Mr. Raymond Di Perna left a detailed phone message for the examiner, authorizing the change of the "may be" phrases to "are" in the above identified independent claims, to be made via an examiner's amendment.